

MINUTES
Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting
Troutdale City Hall – Council Chambers
104 SE Kibling Avenue
Troutdale, OR 97060-2099

Tuesday, September 26, 2006, 2006

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

Mayor Thalhoffer called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Thalhoffer, Councilor Gorsek, Councilor Ripma, Councilor Thomas, Councilor Kyle and Councilor Daoust.

ABSENT: Councilor Canfield (excused)

STAFF: John Anderson, City Administrator; Jim Galloway, Public Works Director; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; Kathy Leader, Finance Director; Marnie Allen, City Attorney; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; Clyde Keebaugh, Parks and Facilities Supervisor.

GUESTS: See Attached.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

- 2.1 ACCEPT MINUTES:** July 25, 2006 Regular Meeting, August 15, 2006 Special Meeting and August 22, 2006 Regular Meeting.
- 2.2 RESOLUTION:** A resolution accepting a perpetual utility easement from Jeff and Nancy Miller adjacent to the estates at Riverbend West Subdivision.
- 2.3 RESOLUTION:** A resolution approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement with employees represented by AFSCME Local 3132.
- 2.4 RESOLUTION:** A resolution approving the Collective Bargaining Agreement with employees represented by the Troutdale Police Officers Association (TPOA).
- 2.5 RESOLUTION:** A resolution adjusting compensation levels for non-represented employees.

MOTION: Councilor Daoust moved to adopt the consent agenda. Seconded by Councilor Thomas. Motion Passed Unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: Please restrict comments to non-agenda items at this time.

Tony Palermini, Volunteer Chairman of the Mt. Hood Community College Bond Campaign, provided the Council with a handout and asked the Troutdale City Council to endorse the

Mt. Hood Community College bond measure. This bond measure is essential in terms of repairs and maintenance that must be done. The cost is very reasonable, \$0.17/\$1,000 assessed value, or \$17 per year on a \$100,000 home.

Councilor Daoust stated I support the bond measure.

Councilor Gorsek stated I must state my conflict of interest because I teach at the college. Living in that environment day after day I know that the campus is in real need of maintenance. This campus is a real asset to our community and we need to support this bond.

Councilor Ripma stated I support the bond measure.

MOTION: Councilor Thomas moved to authorize the Mayor to sign a letter of endorsement representing the Troutdale City Council endorsing the Mt. Hood Community College Bond Measure, 26-83, for the November 2006 election. Seconded by Councilor Gorsek.

Councilor Thomas stated this bond measure is intended to address specific issues that need to be addressed. I think the Board members of the College have put together a very good plan that is worthy of our support.

Councilor Gorsek stated I agree.

Mayor Thalhofer stated I am one hundred percent in support of this measure. This money is needed to help this aging institution. It is a beautiful campus; one of the best in the whole country but it is in need of repairs. It has done so much for so many people in this region and elsewhere. It is time for the people in this region to step up and vote to fix this college so that it can better serve all of the students. I urge folks to vote yes on this measure.

Councilor Daoust stated Councilor Thomas and I talked today about initiating a letter of support and it is a coincidence that you would show up tonight. I attended Mt. Hood Community College 36 years ago and was able to transfer 64 credits to Oregon State.

Councilor Ripma stated I agree with everything that has been said. I do think this is very exceptional. I don't want us to start taking positions on every bond measure that comes along. The college is an exceptional asset. I fully support this; it is so good for the City of Troutdale.

Councilor Thomas stated I had the opportunity to attend some classes at Mt. Hood Community College and I received a great deal of benefit from the college.

VOTE: Mayor Thalhofer – Yes; Councilor Kyle – Yes; Councilor Daoust – Yes; Councilor Gorsek – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Councilor Thomas – Yes.

Motion Passed Unanimously.

4. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE (Introduction): An Ordinance adopting the Troutdale Parks Master Plan and repealing Ordinance No. 635.

Mayor Thalhofer read the ordinance title and opened the public hearing at 7:16pm.

Rich Faith, Community Development Director stated for the last year the city has been engaged in preparing a Parks Master Plan to update our current Plan that was adopted in 1995. This was prepared under the guidance of the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) with assistance from myself and other city staff. We retained the services of a team from the University of Oregon through their Community Planning Workshop. We have worked together this past year to take this Plan through the process and to solicit public comment and community input and I feel we have an excellent product as a result. Chapter 5 and 6 of the Plan gets into the true analysis of our needs and our recommendations for meeting those needs. Chapter 2 of the Plan has an inventory of all of our current parks and open spaces. What that inventory shows us is that our current level of service for our park system provides Troutdale residents with 4.75 acres per 1,000 population. However, what this Plan does is recommends a level of service of 5.2 acres per 1,000 population. That is the same level of service that was reflected in our current 1995 Plan. The maps in the Plan attempt to show some of the best sites for future land acquisition to meet our level of service needs. We also have a map that shows some general locations and routes for future trails. The Plan does recommend an expanded trail system throughout the City to enhance pedestrian and bicycle use. We have also included a map in the Plan that is a conceptual development plan for Sunrise Park. Chapter 6 talks about the costs that are associated with various improvements and acquisitions and the funding strategies to pay for the improvements and acquisitions. The total cost that has been estimated to meet the identified improvements, acquisitions and development of those lands to meet our recommended level of service is \$22.5 million. An aspect of the Plan that will need some discussion and a decision on your part is Glenn Otto Park. In the Plan we have reflected the improvements that were identified in the Glenn Otto Park Master Plan approved by Council in January of 2003. The costs associated with that plan were \$2.9 million. Those costs are carried over into this Plan specific to Glenn Otto Park. However, there is nothing in the Glenn Otto Park Master Plan that talks about adding additional land to expand that park. We do know that the property across the street from Glenn Otto Park, the Glenn White property, is on the market and the Council has discussed the idea of perhaps purchasing some or all of this property in the past. We are looking for some feedback from the Council as to whether or not you want to pursue that property and if so it would be my suggestion to reflect that cost in this Plan. There is one area that the Planning Commission (PC) differed from the recommendation of the Parks Advisory Committee (PAC) and that has to do with Woodale Park. As you know Woodale Park is not very well known about by the public and is one of the least used parks in the City by virtue of its location. It has poor accessibility and visibility and I would venture to say that the vast majority of people living in Troutdale don't even know that this park exists. The PAC concluded that the City should explore options to dispose of its interest in this park. However, when this Plan went before the PC there was public testimony to try and do some things to enhance Woodale Park's benefit to the public. The PC, in their Final Order, offered some substitute language in terms of some low cost improvements that could be done such as signage, adding picnic benches and plantings that might increase the awareness and use of the park and therefore provide more public benefit than it has before. That is quite a

difference in terms of the language that is now authored in the Plan which is the PAC's recommendation. Another part of the update was looking at the question of implementing a parkland dedication ordinance. The City Council has wanted to investigate the possibility of having an ordinance or requirement in our Development Code that would obligate residential developments to actually dedicate a portion of their land to the City as parkland. I had done some preliminary research on that and presented Council with some different models and on the basis of that the Council made a determination as to which they felt was the most favorable for us to pursue. However, I felt that it would be a more appropriate time to look at that question during the Parks Master Plan update along with all of the other information that we would be collecting and reviewing. I asked the consultant to research this topic and to provide us with information and a recommendation. The consultant's report on a parkland dedication ordinance is included in my staff report as Exhibit D. The consultant's recommendation is that this probably is not the way that we would want to go if our goal is to acquire the type of lands that we have a deficiency in. I feel that the consultants have done a great job of explaining this in their report to you. The question is before you this evening whether you are satisfied with their report and recommendation or whether you still feel that a parkland dedication ordinance has merit and you want to pursue that. Adoption of this Plan does not of itself authorize any one of these projects to happen. Every one of these projects would have to be evaluated on its own merits at that time. Adoption of the Plan merely serves as a guide for future budgetary decisions and acquisitions of parkland. Recognizing that the \$22.5 million of improvements is far more than what we are currently collecting through our parks system development charges and it is not realistic to expect that we would increase the system development charges to the level that would gain us all of that money. Obviously the City is going to be faced with making some priority decisions in the future. With the adoption of this Plan we would still need to look into other types of funding programs such as grants.

Bethany Johnson, Project Manager for this project stated the Community Planning Workshop is the organization that I work for that is a wonderful teaching environment where we involve graduate students in actual planning projects in cities around Oregon. I will let Daniel, who is one of five graduate students that worked with me on this Plan, give you a brief presentation about what we did.

Daniel Christensen stated I am a second year planning student at the University of Oregon. As a student, participating in this project this is a very meaningful experience for me.

Daniel Christensen showed the Council a PowerPoint presentation (copy of the presentation is included in the packet). The presentation included information on why we need a parks master plan, how we completed the plan, what the key findings were, what is being recommended, and how much it will cost. We inventoried the entire existing park system and we came up with 258 acres in the total system. Almost 100 acres of that are natural areas that the City doesn't own but the City maintains (such as riverfront area around Glenn Otto Park which is state land). The City has 14 developed parks and 1 undeveloped park, which is Woodale Park. To meet the recommended level of service of 5.2 acres per 1,000 population, we will need to add 40.59 acres of land for parks.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked how many parking slots are being proposed for Sunrise Park?

Bethany Johnson replied we didn't go into actually designing the parking slots. We developed a conceptual plan and that identified some parking to the east and some to the west. If this becomes the adopted conceptual plan then you will get into the actual design of the park and decide exactly how many parking slots you will have.

Rich Faith stated the public that attended the design workshop specifically stated that they did not want to see a lot of parking. Their preference would be that there would be a minimal number of parking spaces but they clearly did not want a large parking lot.

Bethany Johnson stated it was also important to them that we have parking on both the east and west side of the park to disburse the size of the parking lot but also to provide equal access.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked did you consider the type of material that is used on the walking trail? There have been some complaints from people who have sprained their ankle because of the walking surface.

Bethany Johnson replied there was a lot of discussion about that at the two community workshops. People want to preserve the natural feel of the park so they don't want a wide concrete trail. However, people did say that it is hard to use a stroller on the trail and it is hard for elderly folks to walk on the very uneven surface. I did do some research and I have given Clyde Keebaugh some information about a type of material you can use that solidifies and gives you that hard surface but it doesn't look like concrete.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated Woodale Park has been a problem for years and we have tried to deal with it for years. I have been on both sides of this issue but most of the time I am on the preservation side, but it is getting to the point that unless there is broader use by the public it doesn't make sense for the City to maintain it. On the other hand who wants to sell it so that houses could be built in the middle of the houses that surround the park. If we are going to retain it we need to provide better access and signage. With regards to trails, what about connecting some trails to the 40-Mile Loop. In our Urban Renewal Plan that was approved in May we have a promenade along the river, we have talked about connecting that to the 40-Mile Loop. We need to make sure that our trails are safe. I was one of the proponents of the parkland dedication ordinance but I can see where it is just not the way to go. I am in favor of acquiring the Glenn White property. One of the places that we need a park in my opinion is in the area of the Strebin property. Rich could you give us an update on that.

Rich Faith replied Metro did acquire 15 acres along Beaver Creek as part of the Strebin Farm property several years ago. My understanding is that the Strebin Farm is divided into two different ownerships. I believe that the Strebin family owns some and there is a trust that owns some. I also recall that there was a commitment that the land would remain in farm use for a period of ten years, and that goes back at least six years now so it is getting close to the end of that ten year period.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated at some point we could attempt to purchase a portion of that land.

Rich Faith stated we expressed our interest several years ago when the Parks Advisory Committee recommended to the Council that we pursue acquisition of some of the larger pieces of property for parkland. The Council directed me to send a letter to the Strebins family, Baker family and to Multnomah County expressing our interest in acquiring a portion of their property. We will be meeting with the Baker family and their attorney tomorrow to discuss purchasing a portion of their property for a future park.

Councilor Daoust stated Chapter 6, Table 6.11 (page 6.7) shows the proposed projects and the cost of each of those proposed projects. You talk about the Parks and Facility Building being located within Columbia Park but there is no cost showing for that. What is the reason for not showing any cost associated with locating that building in Columbia Park?

Bethany Johnson replied from our perspective the Parks and Facility Building is not really a park improvement so we didn't include it in the Plan.

Rich Faith stated I agree, it really is not thought of as an improvement to the park, it is a facility that the City would own, the same as City Hall or the Police Department. I didn't view it as a capital cost that relates to the park.

Councilor Daoust asked so it would not qualify for any of the funding mechanisms brought up in this report?

Rich Faith replied it would be highly questionable that it would qualify for use of park system development charges.

Councilor Daoust asked what about a bond.

Rich Faith replied if your question is, if we were to float a park bond could that be one of the items included, I think it could be. It doesn't necessarily have to be reflected in the Plan to qualify to be included in the bond.

Councilor Daoust stated I was just looking at the table to be all inclusive.

John Anderson, City Administrator stated in this year's budget process we included funding for the relocation of the Parks and Facilities Division within the General Fund.

Councilor Daoust stated that it makes sense to me to sell Woodale Park. Would it be logical to have that as one of the funding strategies? I realize that the Planning Commission was against that but the Parks Advisory Committee does want to do that and the Council really hasn't voted on this issue yet.

Rich Faith replied that is correct. There is some additional information that is relevant to this discussion and that is, what is our legal ability to sell that parkland.

Marnie Allen, City Attorney stated the way that the City acquired the property we don't have the right to sell it. We can possibly vacate our interest and have it revert back to the County, otherwise we have to maintain our ownership. Basically this land was dedicated; we didn't

pay anything for it so we are kind of holding it in trust for public use. We have a time limit that we have to maintain its use in that way before we can sell it.

Rich Faith stated we have six more years. Once we have held this property in trust for at least 20 years, if at that time we decide to vacate our interests the County can waive their interests. Until that 20 years are up the County doesn't have that right and it would automatically revert back to them.

Councilor Daoust asked was there any consideration or thought given to an additional funding strategy of collecting a user fee at Glenn Otto Park, for example collecting \$2 per car for parking?

Bethany Johnson replied that was a question that was asked on the survey that we sent out and the majority of the folks said they are in favor of a user fee. We then asked if they answered yes, how much would you think is appropriate and \$2 was the amount that most people said would be appropriate. That fee won't make millions of dollars but it could help supplement some of the costs associated with Glenn Otto Park.

Councilor Daoust asked but it didn't warrant trying to figure out how much money that would bring in as a funding mechanism?

Bethany Johnson stated we didn't do that but it would be easy to estimate that figure.

Councilor Daoust stated you did a great job on the Plan, but just to be all inclusive I would have included all of the funding sources that we could utilize, even to the point of including what the cost would be to acquire the White property. Is it unreasonable to include that also?

Rich Faith replied if the Council has an interest in purchasing that property, then I think it would be appropriate to get an estimate and factor that into the Plan. In preparing this Plan and referring to the adopted Master Plan for Glenn Otto Park, it did not show or anticipate any additional land being acquired for expansion of the parking lot, so that number doesn't show up here.

Councilor Daoust asked so if we wanted to factor that in do we amend the Plan?

Rich Faith replied yes. In the final Plan we could add a line item under Glenn Otto Park for acquiring the property.

Councilor Daoust stated my opinion is to factor all of these items in right now rather than wait until later so that we have an all inclusive Parks Plan. I don't favor the parkland dedication ordinance.

Councilor Gorsek asked in terms of the funding sources, do we currently have someone available to work on grant applications?

Rich Faith replied there is no one person dedicated to being a grant writer. When we know of a grant program that we feel we have a good project for that would have a fairly good chance of being funded, then we will make the effort to dedicate staff time.

Councilor Gorsek stated that is something that maybe we should be thinking about, even a part-time person would be helpful. In the Parks Plan have we given thought to brush removal to help prevent fires?

Bethany Johnson replied in this Plan we haven't addressed maintenance. We recognize that maintenance is a critical part of the parks system but we didn't address that in this Plan.

Councilor Gorsek asked Clyde to address that question.

Clyde Keebaugh, Parks and Facilities Supervisor replied as part of our routine maintenance we do a lot of perimeter mowing to keep grass and brush down. We do try to stay aware of excessive slash buildup.

Councilor Gorsek asked how did you come up with the level of service being 5.2 acres per 1,000 population?

Bethany Johnson replied we received some direction from the Parks Advisory Committee. They wanted us to maintain the same level of service as the 1995 Plan set out, and that was 5.2 acres per 1,000 population.

Councilor Gorsek stated in the Plan for Sunrise Park there was a desire to maintain the trees. I noticed this past summer that quite a few of the trees had been cut in the park along the southern perimeter. Council you explain that?

Clyde Keebaugh replied there was a number of cottonwood trees removed from that end of the park for a variety of reasons. They were volunteers that came in and they were beginning to infringe upon view and they were also beginning to overtake some of our drainage system. They were getting large enough that they were beginning to impact our draining which we have to maintain for DEQ requirements for a landfill.

Councilor Gorsek asked if we proposed more trees for the park is that really what people are going to want or will they infringe on the views again?

Clyde Keebaugh replied we would select trees that are smaller in size.

Councilor Ripma stated I understand the purpose of the Master Plan is to layout directions and strategy. It was not my impression that we were considering an all-inclusive list of the improvements at the individual parks. Councilor Daoust's question and your answer to it has confused me. If we adopt this Plan are we saying that the Plan for Sunrise Park that you have set out here is the plan that the City is going to do?

Rich Faith replied yes and no. Adoption of the Plan and the inclusion of the Sunrise Park Concept Plan establishes the concept or the vision for the development of that park. Specific

details could change slightly but what we told the folks that attended the design workshops was that it will still need to go through a full land use review. What we intended to do is take a more detailed design plan and take that to the Planning Commission for comment. The details would include the number of parking stalls, where the trails will be located, etc. In a sense you are giving your stamp of approval to this but it doesn't give us the green light to go out and start building in accordance to this concept. It means that we need to come up with a more detailed plan that will be evaluated and subject to public comment.

Councilor Ripma asked does this Plan cover every single park?

Rich Faith replied no. We have a separate Master Plan for Glenn Otto Park and we reference that in this Plan. For example, Kiki Park and Weedin Park already exist and the improvements are already there and what this Plan does is identify enhancements to those parks such as picnic shelters, benches and swings. There are minor enhancements to those parks recognizing that as population increases the use of the park will increase and therefore we will need to add more amenities to those parks but we are not talking about modifying the existing parks.

Councilor Ripma asked on page 6.7, Table 6.11 is a list of costs, I think your answer to Councilor Daoust is that the list is not all inclusive but it is listing some of the concepts and before this would get built it would come to us for a final decision.

Rich Faith replied not those things listed in Table 6.11 to 6.13. Another way I can answer this is we view Sunrise Park as essentially not yet developed. There have been some improvements that have occurred but there has never really been a comprehensive concept plan done for Sunrise Park that the Council has agreed to. We felt it was appropriate to do one, similar to what we have done with Glenn Otto Park. We also have done one for Columbia Park. We felt this was the right opportunity to do one for Sunrise Park. We are not talking about doing a master plan for our other existing parks; we are simply talking about adding additional amenities to those parks.

Councilor Ripma asked if we approve this, with regard to Sunrise Park, we are adopting a Master Plan for Sunrise Park?

Rich Faith replied yes.

Councilor Ripma asked we are not funding any of this?

Rich Faith replied correct, adoption of this Plan does not fund anything.

Councilor Ripma asked where is the Riverfront Park in this Plan?

Councilor Daoust stated the trail is included.

Councilor Ripma stated I think at least some of us are hoping that it will be more than just that.

Rich Faith replied the only place it is reflected is on map 5.3 on page 5.9 showing the connection under the railroad to the former sewage treatment plant site and then continuation of the riverfront trail.

Councilor Ripma stated I am wondering if it might be wise to add something. Where would the Riverfront Park fit? Is it a community park, neighborhood park or a mini park?

Bethany Johnson replied it would probably be a special use park.

Councilor Ripma asked would it be appropriate to add it to Table 6.13 under special use parks? You could list some amenities besides just the trail because I think the public is expecting that park to be built with more than just a trail. That is an addition that I would suggest. Does this Plan set out a strategy for Woodale Park?

Bethany Johnson stated we have the PAC's recommendation which is to dispose of the property but then there is a complication that was explained to you about needing to wait six more years. There is also the PC's recommendation which is to not dispose of the property and to think about what you could do to utilize the park. My understanding is that we are looking for direction from the Council on that issue tonight.

Councilor Ripma stated I think it is okay to have the Parks Master Plan silent on how to deal with it. I don't think we need a development plan for Woodale Park yet.

Rich Faith stated the Plan as now drafted or proposed includes (on Page 5.2) the Parks Advisory Committee's recommendation. That doesn't mean that the City will do that, it simply states that it was the recommendation of the Parks Advisory Committee. In the Planning Commission's Final Order they recommend substitute language for that paragraph. So the question to the Council is, which language do you prefer?

Councilor Ripma stated I think it is good the way it is.

Councilor Thomas asked we had a work session not too long ago discussing Woodale Park and one of the decisions made was to have the Parks Advisory Committee meet with the neighbors and ask them how the property should be disposed of. I assume that hasn't been pursued because of the six year waiting period.

Rich Faith replied correct.

Councilor Thomas stated the part of the Plan that I really like and that fits what I have been hearing from the community is the creation of more community parks. This Plan provides some clear details and has specific goals.

Mayor Thalhoffer called for a break at 9:05pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:15pm.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is there anyone here that would like to speak to us on this issue?

Ken Horner stated I live at the north end of Sunrise Park. From what I understand Sunrise Park was one of, if not the most popular park the way it currently exists. I don't really see the need to add any additional structures or anything else to that park. I like the park and I would like to see it left the way it is.

Steve Smith stated I would like you to reject this Plan until a couple of things have happened to it. If we are going to play with an unfunded mandate, which this is, lets get serious about making a hard document and going somewhere with this instead of just filing it away. By that we need to delineate the goals, objectives and proposals and prioritize them in this Plan. We have all of these items that don't have any line items and it makes it very difficult for the public to look at this document and be able to specifically object to or comment on a specific goal, objective or proposal. I would like to ask the Council to ask the City Attorney for a report on what happens when a city does not comply with LCDC Goals and Guidelines, in particular Goal 5. 94% of the people in the survey have said they like the parks the way they are. That says a lot about what is going on now and where we are at and maybe that is where we need to be. People like what they have now so maybe we don't need to tweak, bend and develop. I am totally against any kind of park on the Strebin property due to the fact that you are building a park for a land developer that is going to come in here and develop that property which will have the highest number of new residential units developed on it. This is the largest piece of property we have in the city. What you want to do is to put a park in here for a land developer who is going to get tax breaks because so much of the land is zoned for apartments. It will also end up being low income and HUD housing. Why not have a human exclusion zone in Beaver Creek Canyon. You talk about preserving the wildlife and preserving the habitat. In the Plan it says you are going to identify areas of environmental significance to be fully protected from development. To me development means a trail; that is encroaching upon the fish, wildlife and habitat of that natural area. We already have about 15 acres on the Strebin property as Metro property that may be developed as a park or greenway. The piece of property that we really need to acquire is the property just down stream from Troutdale Road because that is the most diverse piece of habitat in Beaver Creek Canyon. It is also the largest flat area in Beaver Creek Canyon. If you put 700 new dwellings on that Strebin property and then you are not going to deny access into that very sensitive habitat, that doesn't make sense. The unfunded mandate needs to define development. I think we need to give a much stronger look at where we build our trails. Linking the Mt. Hood Community College area to the Beaver Creek Canyon is a bad idea. You would have police enforcement problems. The main thing I am trying to say is stay out of Beaver Creek Canyon. Leave it alone. We don't need to be part of Metro's 40-Mile Loop.

Mayor Thalhoffer closed the public hearing at 9:27pm.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated for the Glenn White property I think we should get an up to date appraisal. Are there any objections to that?

Councilor Ripma asked do you mean get an appraisal and include it in the Plan?

Mayor Thalhoffer replied yes.

Councilor Daoust stated it would be in addition to the \$2.9 million for the Glenn Otto Master Plan that shows in the Parks Plan now, so there would be another line item for the White property acquisition.

Councilor Ripma asked could that be done by the next meeting?

Rich Faith replied we wouldn't be able to have an appraisal done. I think we could include an estimate in the Plan if it is the Council's desire to show some property acquisition as part of the Glenn Otto Park improvements.

Council agreed to include an estimate for the acquisition of Glenn White's property in the Parks Master Plan under Glenn Otto Park improvements.

Mayor Thalhofler stated the riverfront promenade and the public plaza will be built with urban renewal funds so it is not going to be part of financing this, is that correct.

Rich Faith stated all of the improvements that are shown in this Plan are not synonymous with SDC eligible expenditures.

Mayor Thalhofler stated I understand that. We passed urban renewal and part of the reason that people voted for it is because we said we needed the urban renewal money for the riverfront promenade and a riverfront park. We need to have both of those and they can be purchased with urban renewal funds as I understand it.

Rich Faith replied yes they can.

Councilor Kyle stated my only comment would be on the parkland dedication ordinance and I think we are probably beyond that. We don't have enough development left to incorporate that.

Mayor Thalhofler asked does everyone agree that we can omit the parkland dedication ordinance?

Council agreed.

Councilor Daoust stated the only other item that I brought up earlier was the parks and facilities building, it is not in the Master Plan.

Councilor Thomas stated part of that is included in the urban renewal.

Councilor Daoust stated the answer staff gave was that it is included in the 2006-07 Budget to relocate the Parks and Facilities Division. I still question whether it should be part of the Plan even though it is already in the budget.

John Anderson stated you could list it in the Plan with urban renewal funds as the specific revenue source.

Councilor Thomas stated moving them is more of a maintenance issue versus a parks issue and I am not sure that having it in the Plan makes a lot of sense. I see it more as a city services issues versus a Parks Master Plan need.

Councilor Daoust stated in my view it is part of the Columbia Park Master Plan.

Councilor Thomas stated okay, that is fine.

Rich Faith stated the other item that I was asking for direction on was Woodale Park and whether you wanted to go with the current language, which is the recommendation of the Parks Advisory Committee or the alternate language that the Planning Commission recommended.

Councilor Thomas stated with regard to Woodale I wouldn't change the Plan.

Councilor Ripma stated I favor leaving the language as drafted in the Plan.

Council agreed to leave the current language in the Plan regarding Woodale Park, which is the Parks Advisory Committee recommendation.

Councilor Kyle stated the last person who testified said we should have some Goal 5 concerns. Councilor Kyle asked Marnie Allen to check on that.

Rich Faith stated I need clarification on the Council's direction on whether you want the Parks and Facilities building cost included in this Plan or not.

Councilor Ripma stated I favor adding it.

Councilor Thomas stated based on the discussion I withdrew my concerns.

Rich Faith stated so you are in agreement to add a cost figure associated with moving the Parks and Facilities building into the Plan under Columbia Park.

Council agreed.

Rich Faith asked is that also what you want done for the Public Plaza on the urban renewal site.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated and the promenade along the river.

Rich Faith stated we have two different things, there is the promenade along the waterfront and then there is the public plaza. The promenade to a certain extent is already addressed because we show that on the trail map and it is included in the linear footage of the trails so there is a cost associated with that. We haven't included the public plaza.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated which is the same as a public park.

Rich Faith stated yes, so it is the public park/plaza that we are talking about.

Councilor Ripma stated the trail is just identified as a trail, it doesn't have a single bench. Give us a guess as to what it is really going to look like.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated with turnouts that people can stand in and view the river and wildlife.

Rich Faith stated I think we have some numbers in the Urban Renewal Plan that we can include.

To allow time to make all of the recommended changes Council agreed to hold the second public hearing on this ordinance on October 24, 2006.

5. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

None.

6. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Mayor Thalhoffer stated that he attended the funeral last week for Sergeant Nathaniel "Brad" Lindsey.

Councilor Gorsek stated that October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month and encouraged folks to reach out to anyone who is in a domestic violence situation.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Councilor Thomas moved to adjourn. Seconded by Councilor Ripma. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45pm.

Paul Thalhoffer, Mayor

Approved November 14, 2006

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder